APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/431,002	11/01/1999	HADI PARTOVI	22379-702	8108

7590   02/21/2003

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
TWO NORTH MARKET STREET
THIRD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER
THOMPSON, MARC D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	15

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ___3___ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Dec 12, 2002* _____ .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-25* _____ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-25* _____ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on ___*Nov 1, 1999*___ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

　　If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

　　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

　　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

　　a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This application has been reassigned to a new Examiner. See **Conclusion** section below,

for new Examiner contact information.

2.   Amendment A, Paper #14, received 12/12/2002, has been entered into record.

3.   Claims 1-25 remain pending.

Priority

4.   This application is a continuation-in-part of parent 09/426,102, filed 10/22/1999.

5.   The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims which has

support in parent 12/12/2002 in this application is 10/22/1999. Any new subject matter defined

in the claims not previously disclosed in parent 09/426,102, is entitled to the effective filing date

of 11/1/1999.

Information Disclosure Statement

6.   Examiner notes multiple IDS papers entered previously into record, namely Paper

numbers 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, and 12, filed 12/2/1999, 12/27/1999, 1/19/2000, 7/18/2000, 3/27/2001,

and 6/26/2001, respectively. Many of these IDS statements contain(ed) duplicate entries, and all

have been considered by the previous Examiner. It is unclear to the current Examiner which IDS

statements were supplied to Applicant with the last Office action, Paper #13. If Applicant failed

to receive any of these considered IDS documents, Applicant is invited to contact the current

Examiner for verification, further clarification, or copies of the IDS statements.

Drawings

7.   The Examiner contends that this application has been filed with drawings which are

acceptable for examination purposes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

9.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the
claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various
claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any
evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out
the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later
invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103©
and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10.   Claims 1-10, 13-17, 19, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Wise et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,262), hereinafter referred to as Wise, in

view of Didcock (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,907), hereinafter referred to as Didcock, further in view

of Kamel et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,937,037), hereinafter referred to as Kamel.

        Regarding claims 1 and 25, Wise teaches a method of providing content from the Internet

to a telephone using a computer system. See Column 1, Line 66 through Column 2, Line 2. The

computer system included a telephone interface system coupled with an Internet access system,

and a standard telephone. See Figure 1, hardware (100), Column 5, Lines 35-42, telephony board

(111), computer network (15), and standard telephone (10). Wise further taught receiving an

Internet access request, the Internet access request corresponding to an Internet site outside of the

computer system, receiving the content from the Internet site, which included an audio portion,

and sending at least the audio portion of the content over the telephone interface system to send

an audio signal, corresponding to the audio portion, to the telephone. See Column 2, Lines 5-16.

Wise taught the invention substantially as claimed, however, Wise did not expressly teach

streaming content, or any specifics related directly to implicit request/response generation from

the computer network entities. Also, Wise expressly provided the provision for user profiles and

storage of user preferences. See Column 3, Lines 9-18. Although Wise disclosed the invention

substantially as claimed, Wise remained silent as to how the specifics of a given profile were

used in combination with the user experience using the network. An artisan would have been

motivated to search for details involving inclusion of profile information for decision making.

Further, an artisan working with the Wise system would have also been motivated to search the

related arts for two inherent features of a network of this type, namely information transport, and

billing for network usage. These two features were only a small portion of inherent concerns

network computer artisans would have been motivated to explore, since Wise did not directly

address such details in the description of the invention.

Didcock discloses streaming as a well-known technique for delivering pace-content

information across a network. See Didcock, Column 1, Lines 27-29. Thus, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the

teachings of Wise with the streaming content of Didcock because it permitted access to an

internet by people with special needs, e.g., the visually impaired, while the system provided

telephone based voice messaging independent of the speed of the links coupling users' computers

to the network. See Didcock, Column 2, Lines 6-9, and Column 3, Lines 29-34. Further, since

the Wise system utilized network information transport, specifically audio, and Didcock dealt

directly with maintaining quality of service when utilizing the network for audio reception

(Column 1, Line 58 through Column 2, Line 9), incorporating the teachings of Didcock into the

system of Wise would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made.

Further, in the same art of network/Internet telephony, Kamel provided a method for

targeting user clients of the network with advertisements and promotional messages to groups

and individuals based on the contents of the messages and particular user/group profiles. See

Column 1, Lines 57-62. The system allowed user clients to build credit(s) for use of the network

system by interacting with the promotional advertisements. See Column 4, Lines 36-49. The

system was also implementable in a system using particular subscribers and associated voice/data

mailboxes. See Column 4, Lines 50-65. Thus, an arbitrary user of the network would have been

required to interact with the message(s) in order to use the system for telephony. See Column 4,

Lines 36-49. This would have provided an ordinary artisan with minimal requisites to ensure use

of the network system was not at the expense of those not using the network for information

transport.

Kamel disclosed "[receiving an] Internet access request implicitly based on at least one

user personalization choice...", as claimed. By allowing a user to request a connection with a

remote device (e.g., telephone), where the calling user then received promotional information or

an advertisement, implicitly, i.e., the user did not ask for the advertisement, selected and

delivered to the user based on the user profile. See Column 1, Line 57 through Column 2, Line

10, Column 5, Lines 27-42, and Column 24, Lines 43-67. Indeed, this system was completely

compatible with a voice message network application, accessible through an internet server. See

Column 4, Lines 52-55, and Column 11, Lines 32-36. This system further selected messages for

streaming to end user equipment before (Column 24, Lines 43-54), during (Column 25,

Lines 8-12), and after (Column 26, Lines 13-15), the call was initiated. Thus, in many of these

embodiments, when a user accesses the system, s/he was presented with streaming, Internet

originated, audio information, without making a single explicit request. Thus, the provision for

implicit requests based on user profile entries was fully disclosed by Kamel.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the telephony system of Wise and Didcock with the telephony methodology of

Kamel, in order to ensure compensation for use of the network services. The associated

teachings of Kamel also additionally included the "filtering" and determination of "relevant"

content to user(s) based on their profile entries, commensurate with the general teachings of Wise

at Column 1, Line 37 through Column 2, Line 17, and generalized inclusion of modular

functionality set forth in Column 4, Lines 17 through Column 5, Line 28.

Regarding claim 2, Wise further taught wherein receiving the Internet access request

comprises receiving a verbal request (Column 2, Lines 5-7) to access the Internet site and

performing voice recognition (Column 2, Lines 7-8 & Line 50) on the verbal request to

determine the Internet access request.

Regarding claim 3, Wise further taught receiving the Internet access request comprises:

receiving a series of one or more touch tone signals (DTMF, Column 2, Lines 5-7) and decoding

the series of one or more touch tone signals (Column 2, Lines 7-8) to determine the Internet

access request.

Regarding claim 4, Wise further taught providing a menu corresponding to accessible

Internet sites, and wherein the receiving the Internet access request corresponds to receiving a

selection from the menu (Column 2, Lines 25-26).

Regarding claim 5, Wise further taught determining the type of streaming content and

converting the corresponding type of streaming content into an audio portion (Column 2,

Lines 11-15).

Regarding claim 6, Wise further taught the Internet access system includes a web server,

wherein the web server connects to the Internet site to receive the streaming content (Column 8,

Lines 44-45).

Regarding claim 7, Wise further taught the streaming content was received as packet data (Column 9, Lines 47-50) from a packet switched network and wherein the telephone interface system communicates the audio signal (Column 9, Lines 47-50; Wise discloses a standard analog telephone which inherently communicates over the PSTN) to a Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN).

Regarding claim 8, Wise teaches a URL relating to a verbal phrase (Column 6, Lines 46-49). In the computing networking arts, a universal/unique resource locator (URL) and a universal/unique resource identifier (URI), are logically identical. A URL which specifies a particular network location, is a URI, i.e., a unique identifier which points to a particular network resource.

Regarding claim 9, Wise further taught computer system includes personalized content information (Column 3, Lines 10-13) and wherein the Internet access request is generated (Column 3, Lines 15-16) from the personalized content information.

Regarding claim 10, Didcock further taught the computer system further comprises a local streaming content system (Didcock, Figure 2, stream management unit 222), the local streaming content system including a second streaming content (Column 2, Lines 40-43), the second streaming content including at least a second audio portion (Data blocks; Column 2, Lines 43-46 & Lines 58-59), and wherein the method further comprises accessing the local streaming content system to provide a second audio signal corresponding to the second audio portion to the telephone (Column 2, Lines 58-62).

Regarding claim 13, Didcock further taught an audio repository (LTSR; Column 2,

Lines 37-39), wherein the method further comprises accessing the audio content from the

repository to provide to the telephone (Column 2, Lines 61-62).

Regarding claim 14, Didcock further taught receiving a command (Column 5,

Lines 65-67), the command corresponding to a request by the telephone user to adjust the

sending of the audio portion (pause command; Column 6, Lines 1-2), and adjusting the sending

of the audio portion (Column 10, Lines 6-8).

Regarding claim 15, Wise and Didcock further taught commands corresponding to a

pause command (Didcock, Column 6, Line 2), and wherein the sending the audio portion is

paused and wherein a pause command is sent out to the Internet site (Wise, Column 2,

Lines 25-26).

Regarding claim 16, Didcock further taught the command corresponds to a pause

command (Didcock, Column 6, Line 2), and wherein the sending the audio portion is paused and

wherein at least the audio portion of the streaming content is cached during the pause (Didcock

Column 10, Lines 5-8 & Column 2, Lines 38-40).

Regarding claim 17, the combined system of Wise, Didcock, and Kamel taught a

computer system to deliver streaming content (Didcock, Column 1, Lines 27-29) from the

Internet to a telephone, the computer system comprising:

an Internet interface including at least one program (parser; Wise, Column 6, Line 40) to

receive the streaming content in response to an implicit request based on at least one user

personalization choice from the Internet and extract a streaming audio signal from the streaming

content (Wise, Column 5, Lines 66-67, and Kamel, Column 1, Line 57 through Column 2,

Line 10, Column 4, Lines 52-55, Column 5, Lines 27-42, Column 11, Lines 32-36, and

Column 24, Lines 43-67).

a telephone interface to send an audio signal to the telephone, the audio signal

corresponding to the streaming audio signal (Wise, Column 6, Lines 1-2 & 7-8); and a control

subsystem to control the Internet interface and the telephone interface (Wise, Column 5,

Lines 33-35).

Regarding claim 24, Wise further taught the telephone interface subsystem includes a call

manager (Figure 2, call manager 210), the call manager supporting multiple simultaneous

telephone calls over the telephone interface, at least one of the telephone calls receiving the

streaming audio signal. While Wise did not explicitly teach multiple simultaneous telephone

calls, Didcock taught simultaneous audio streams (Column 5, Line 24). Previously made

OFFICIAL NOTICE regarding the change in the number of calls as a design consideration as

known to one with ordinary skill in the art, is hereby treated as Applicant admitted prior art for

the remainder of prosecution. See MPEP § 2144.03.

Thus, since all the claimed invention limitations were expressly set forth by the

combination of Wise, Didcock, and Kamel, claims 1-10, 13-17, 19, and 24-25 are rejected.

11.   Claims 11, 12, and 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

the combination of Wise, Didcock, and Kamel, as applied to claim 10 above, further in view of

Billings et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,115,747), hereinafter referred to as Billings.

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Wise, Didcock, and Kamel taught the invention

substantially as claimed as detailed above. The combination did not teach mixing

(merging/multiplexing, etc.) the audio portion with the second audio portion and wherein the

audio signal corresponds to the mix. However, in the same art of information retrieval with data

streams, Billings taught merged data packets to form a combined stream (Column 4,

Lines 26-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify the combination of Wise, Didcock, and Kamel with the

combined stream of Billings because it allows content delivery to be optimized for a particular

users' retrieval needs.

Regarding claim 12, Didcock and Billings further taught an audio repository (Didcock,

LTSR, Column 2, Lines 37-39), wherein the method further comprises accessing the audio

content from the repository to provide to the telephone (Didcock, Column 2, Lines 61-62), and

mixing the audio portion with the second audio portion and the audio content (Billings,

Column 4, Lines 26-28).

Regarding claims 18-20, Didcock and Billings further taught an audio repository

(Didcock, LTSR, Column 2, Lines 37-39) storing audio storing sounds, and the computer system

included a second program (Billings, merging processor, Column 9, Lines 29-31) causing at least

some sounds to be mixed with the streaming audio signal (Billings, Column 4, Lines 26-28).

Regarding claim 21, Kamel taught delivering promotional messages to telephone

subscribers via telephone networks (Kamel, Column 1, Lines 9-11 & Lines 59-60).

Regarding claim 22, Kamel further taught personal preference information and wherein

the advertisement is chosen based at least partially upon the personal preference information

(Kamel, Column 1, Lines 9-11).

Regarding claim 23, Wise further taught where at least one sound is a system prompt

(Wise, Column 9, Lines 7-8).

Response to Arguments

12.   Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues one specific feature of the claimed invention which alleges to distinguish the

currently claimed invention from the prior art of record.

a. Applicant argues the prior art of record did not expressly disclose a method for

providing streaming content to a telephone in response to an implicit request based on a user

personalization choice. This directly equated to selection and reception of (network retrieved)

information not specifically asked for by the user. Further, this selection of information was

based on an arbitrary user "personalization" choice, e.g., an entry in the user profile. In

Applicant's words, "as such, [chosen/relevant] streaming content can be provided to a user

without the user explicitly requesting the content." See Response, Paper #14, Page 6,

Lines 20-21. It should be clear that Kamel disclosed this express functionality, by allowing a

user to request a connection with a remote device (e.g., telephone), where the calling user then

received promotional information or an advertisement, implicitly, i.e., the user did not ask for the

advertisement, and it was selected based on the user profile. See Column 1, Line 57 through

Column 2, Line 10, Column 5, Lines 27-42, and Column 24, Lines 43-67. Indeed, this system

was completely compatible with a voice message network application, accessible through an

internet server. See Column 4, Lines 52-55, and Column 11, Lines 32-36. This system further

selected messages for streaming to end user equipment before (Column 24, Lines 43-54), during

(Column 25, Lines 8-12), and after (Column 26, Lines 13-15), the call was initiated. Thus, in

many of these embodiments, when a user accesses the system, s/he was presented with streaming,

Internet originated, audio information, without making a single explicit request.

   b. It is noted that Applicant did not properly respond to the last Office Action by failing

to address the teachings of Kamel, as previously applied. All other rejections, not relying on

Kamel, were addressed. Claims 21 and 22 were previously rejected using the combination of

Wise, Didcock, Billings, and Kamel. Failure of applicant to distinguish over this piece of art,

including all the others cited and applied, fails to place this application and the current claims in

condition for allowance.

   c. Further, the breadth of the claims may construe storage of a particular flag, or value, in

a user profile, which resulted in automatic retrieval and presentation (implicitly requested) of a

particular greeting or announcement. Wise brushed on this functionality, inter alia, in Column 1,

Lines 25-36. This type of customized greeting and specialized announcement(s) based upon user

profile entries has been utilized in computer networks for decades. For example, a simple script

file was activated upon "login" to a network, wherein one of contained entries pointed to an

audio file at a remote site (e.g., AOL's "You have mail."). This would meet claim 1, as

amended.

        d. It should be noted that nothing in a computer system is/was expressly "implicit".

Computers only do exactly what they are told, i.e., computers are/were programmed with specific

functionality which dictated proper action response based on computer state(s). Computers are

inherently state machines, i.e., computers are always in a particular state. Based on the state(s) of

the computer/system/ component(s), the computer(s) were instructed to change state. Nothing

thus far indicates any implicit decision making. In fact, it is well known in the art that a

computer which failed to follow instructions explicitly, resulting in an improper state, is denoted

"crashed", since the machine has misinterpreted or misexecuted explicit instructions. As

interpreted by the Examiner, "...request implicitly based on..." related directly to client request(s)

processed by the system which were not directly made by the client. A typical example at the

time of invention was a standard HTML document, containing embedded images. The document

contains addresses of images for presentation, images reside somewhere on the network, and the

client browser or responding server retrieves the image information implicitly, since none of the

individual images were specified in the initial HTML GET request. Thus, direct clarification and

definition of "implicitly" as used in the claims and as known in the art is required to distinguish

over the prior art of record.

e. Any "implicitly" generated request (as opposed to an explicitly generated request) can

reasonably be considered an automation of a manual activity, i.e., automatically generating a

secondary/new request based on an actual (or lack of) explicit request made by a network user, or

simply eliminating any/all explicit request(s). The Examiner does not consider this to constitute

a step of invention. See MPEP § 2144.04 (II) and (III).

f. The inclusion of streaming information as a suitable network transport would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in view of the

notoriously widely known and widely implementation of information streaming for timely

network transport of digital information. Examiner takes Official Notice (see MPEP 2144.03)

that "streaming" in a computer networking environment was well known in the art at the time the

invention was made, as exemplified by several of the patents cited as relevant for this

application. The Applicant is entitled to traverse the official notice according to MPEP §

2144.03. However, MPEP § 2144.03 further states "See also *In re Boon*, 439 F.2d 724, 169

USPQ 231 (CCPA 1971) (a challenge to the taking of judicial notice must contain adequate

information or argument to create on its face a reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances

justifying the judicial notice)." Specifically, *In re Boon*, 169 USPQ 231, 234 states "as we held

in Ahlert, an applicant must be given the opportunity to challenge either the correctness of the

fact asserted or the notoriety or repute of the reference cited in support of the assertion. We did

not mean to imply by this statement that a bald challenge, with nothing more, would be all that

was needed". Further note that 37 CFR § 1.671(c)(3) states "Judicial notice means official

notice". Thus, a traversal by the Applicant that is merely "a bald challenge, with nothing more"

will be given very little weight.

     g. As noted above, previous taking of OFFICIAL NOTICE regarding the change in the

number of calls as a design consideration as known to one with ordinary skill in the art, is hereby

treated as Applicant admitted prior art for the remainder of prosecution. See MPEP § 2144.03.

13.   Lastly, Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered,

but are considered moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

     A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

15.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Examiner should be directed to Marc Thompson whose telephone number is (703) 308-6750.

The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's

supervisor, Mark Powell, can be reached at (703) 305-9703.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are as

follows:

(703) 746-7238   (After Final Communications only)
(703) 746-7239   (Official Communications)
(703) 746-7240   (for Official Status Inquiries, Draft Communications only)
(703) 746-5487   (for informal communications directed to the Examiner)

Inquiries of a general nature relating to the general status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900, or

Customer Service for Technology Center 2100 at (703) 306-5631.

MARC THOMPSON
Marc D. Thompson
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142